

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 9-20 are pending.

***Election/Restrictions***

Applicants elect the invention of b), Claims 9-20. This election is made without traverse.

Applicants reserve the right to filing of divisional applications.

Claims 1-8 and 21-22 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner as being drawn to a non-elected invention. In response, Claims 1-8 and 21-22 are canceled.

***Priority***

The Examiner states that the priority statement on page 1 should be updated. In response, page 1 of the Specification has been amended.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112***

**Claims 9-20 under 35 USC §112 first paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 9-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner is not clear as to whether “polymer in a liquid state” includes a polymer solution or a polymer melt. However, the Applicant has not claimed a “polymer in a liquid state” in Claims 9-20 and accordingly, the rejection is unfounded. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

**Claims 10 and 20 under 35 USC §112 second paragraph**

Claims 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, the Examiner has rejected Claim 10 for no antecedent basis for “the composition.” The Applicant directs the Examiner’s attention to Claim 11 as lacking antecedent basis for “the composition,” rather than the rejected Claim 10. In response, the Applicant has amended Claim 11 to overcome this rejection.

Further, the Examiner has rejected Claim 20 because it was not in Markush terminology. In response, Claim 20 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

Still further, the Examiner has rejected Claim 20 because it was stated that it was not clear what the difference is between a “blend of polymers” and a “combination of polymers,” making the claim vague. In response, the Applicant has amended Claim 20 to overcome this rejection. Specifically, Applicant has stricken the phrase, “blend of polymers” in an effort to clarify that “combination of polymers” includes both a blend and a bonded form of polymers. Support for including both polymer blends and bonded polymers in the definition of the term “combination of polymers” is supported in the Specification at 6:20 and 11:20.

Claims 10 and 20 are now in condition for allowance.

***Conclusion***


Claims 9-20 are pending in this application. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims have been placed in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the

Examiner to enter the foregoing amendments and pass the case to issue. If I can be of any help in anyway, please contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 24, 2006

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.  
One Maritime Plaza  
Suite 300  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone (415) 954-0200  
Facsimile (415) 393-9887  
[aaugustus@ssd.com](mailto:aaugustus@ssd.com)

  
Angie M. Augustus  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 51,421